INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Council of the County of Maui

MINUTES

February 11, 2013

Council Chamber, 8th Floor

CONVENE: 1:30 p.m.

PRESENT: VOTING MEMBERS:

Councilmember Elle Cochran, Chair

Councilmember Stacy Crivello, Vice-Chair (out 3:10 p.m., in 3:12 p.m.)

Councilmember Robert Carroll Councilmember Donald G. Couch, Jr. Councilmember Don S. Guzman

Councilmember G. Riki Hokama (in 1:54 p.m.) Councilmember Mike White (in 1:36 p.m.)

STAFF: Scott Jensen, Legislative Analyst

Yvette Bouthillier, Committee Secretary

Ella Alcon, Council Aide, Molokai Council Office (via telephone conference bridge) Denise Fernandez, Council Aide, Lanai Council Office (via telephone conference bridge) Dawn Lono, Council Aide, Hana Council Office (via telephone conference bridge)

ADMIN.: Robert Parsons, Administrative Assistant II, Office of the Mayor

Kyle Ginoza, Director of Environmental Management

Michael Miyamoto, Deputy Director of Environmental Management

Richelle Thomson, Deputy Corporation Counsel, Department of the Corporation Counsel

Others (10)

PRESS: Akaku: Maui Community Television, Inc.

CHAIR COCHRAN: ...(gavel)... Aloha. Will the Infrastructure and Environmental Management Committee now come to order. I am Councilmember Cochran, the Chair of the Committee. And it is Monday, February 11, 2013 at 1:30 p.m. Thank you, Members, for being here. Before we begin, please silence all cell phones or any other noisemaking devices. Thank you. And the members in attendance I have Committee Vice-Chair Stacy Crivello. Aloha.

VICE-CHAIR CRIVELLO: Aloha.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Bob Carroll.

February 11, 2013

COUNCILMEMBER CARROLL: Good afternoon, Chair.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Don Couch.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Good afternoon, Chair.

CHAIR COCHRAN: And Don Guzman.

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: Aloha, Chair.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Aloha. And I will be having Riki Hokama arriving in a few moments. And it looks like Mike White is excused at the moment also. From Administration, I have Director of Environmental Management Kyle Ginoza.

MR. GINOZA: Good afternoon. Thank you.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Hi. And Deputy Director of Environmental Management Mike Miyamoto. And Deputy Corporation Counsel Richelle Thomson.

MS. THOMSON: Good afternoon.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Aloha. And Committee Staff members, Committee Secretary Yvette Bouthillier, and Legislative Analyst Scott Jensen, and it looks like Ms. Gormley is excused for the moment. We will be having public testimony accepted in just a few moments. And so, at this point, anyone testifying here at the Chambers, it looks like I have the signal that there aren't any. And the testimony would have been limited to the items today. We do have a connection to our remote district offices. And at this point, I will ask the people in our outer offices to state their names. And, let's see, from Hana office?

MS. LONO: Good afternoon, Chair. This is Dawn Lono at the Hana office, and I have no one waiting to testify.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you, Dawn. From our Lanai office?

MS. FERNANDEZ: Good morning. Good afternoon, Chair. This is Denise at the Lanai office, and we have no one to testify.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you. And from our Molokai office.

MS. ALCON: This is Ella Alcon on Molokai, and there is no one here to testify.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you. Well at this point, Members, since there's no one registered to testify, without objections, I shall now close the floor for public testimony.

February 11, 2013

COUNCIL MEMBERS: No objections.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you. All righty then. Moving on. We have two items on the agenda today. And the first item relates to a sewer line easement, transmitted by Department of Environmental Management. Then the second item relates to a presentation by the Department of Environmental Management regarding the organization of the Department and current efforts in wastewater reclamation and solid waste management, including waste-to-energy opportunities.

RESOLUTION ACCEPTING GRANT OF EASEMENT FOR SEWERLINE PURPOSES AND APPROVING TERMINATION OF EASEMENT FOR THE MAUI MALL SUBDIVISION (KAHULUI) (CC 13-26)

CHAIR COCHRAN: IEM-1, Resolution Accepting Grant of Easement for Sewer line Purposes and Approving Termination of Easement for the Maui Mall Subdivision in Kahului. This item is, we are, the Committee is in receipt of County Communication 13-26, from Director of Environmental Management, transmitting a proposed resolution entitled Accepting Grant of Easement for Sewer line Purposes and Approving Termination of Easement for the Maui Mall Subdivision, Pursuant to Chapter 3.44, Maui County Code. The purpose of this proposed resolution is to accept a perpetual, nonexclusive sewer line easement for underground sewer line purposes from A&B Properties, Inc., and approve the termination of an existing sewer line easement within the same parcel, situated in TMK (2) 3-7-009:004 and (2) 3-7-009:030. The Committee may consider whether to recommend adoption of proposed resolution, with or without revisions. The Committee may also consider filing of County Communication 13-26 and other related actions. At this point, I shall turn the floor over to Director Ginoza for an overview.

MR. GINOZA: Thank you. Members, the reason why we're here before you today for this easement is because as a result of one of our CIP projects, the Alamaha force main replacement, we needed to align the force main and gravity line a little to the east side of where the existing easement was. And the reason for that is where the existing easement was, there's a bunch of curbing and some trees that we didn't want to have to displace. Instead of displacing the trees, we decided to move the alignment slightly to the east, resulting in a change of easement. So basically going from where it is, we're deleting a portion of that easement and moving it a little bit to the east. Thank you.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you. Members, I shall now open the floor for any questions that you may have from the Department. Any questions at this time, clarifications? Yes, Mr. Guzman.

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: Thank you, Chair. Mr. Ginoza, you mentioned that you needed to extend out the new line from the existing line, from the existing easement?

MR. GINOZA: No. It's just where -- oh. Chair, may I?

February 11, 2013

CHAIR COCHRAN: Yeah. Go ahead, Director.

MR. GINOZA: Basically, where it was you can see...on the last page of, Page 17 of 17, best illustrates what we did. Basically, the alignment, which is dashed, shows what the old alignment was. But along that alignment, there was some trees that would be impacted if we dug out the line and replaced it. So instead we didn't really extend the line. We just moved the line in. And it basically, at the top of the page, is where our Kahului pump station is. So it basically originated and terminated at the same locations. It's just the alignment was shifted a little.

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: On the old line, it was an eight-inch line?

MR. GINOZA: Yes.

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: Versus the new line, it will be ten inches?

MR. GINOZA: Yes.

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: Is that one of the factors why you also wanted to extend it to the, I believe to the left. Is that right? Or to the right?

MR. GINOZA: To the right. No. That had nothing to do with it. We didn't really extend it. It was just the same points of, points were being connected. It's just in this particular location to not impact trees, we moved it a little to the right. But as part of that improvement, we're changing it from an eight to a ten inch.

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: How big are the landscaping trees? Are they, are they significant?

MR. GINOZA: I mean, they're quite mature. And so it was a lot easier and amenable to the property owner just to deviate a little to the right.

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: I guess my follow-up question would be would it cost the County more to deviate to the right as versus replace, relocation of those plants or those trees.

MR. GINOZA: It would cost more to go under the trees and replace it than to just. . .it was just pavement where we dug up and realigned the line.

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: Thank you.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Are you done, Mr. Guzman? Members. . .(clearing throat). . . Members, any further discussion needed? Questions of the Department?

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Recommendation?

CHAIR COCHRAN: Okay, thank you. So Members, I will entertain a motion to recommend adoption of the proposed resolution and filing of this County Communication.

February 11, 2013

VICE-CHAIR CRIVELLO: So moved, Chair.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER CARROLL: Second.

CHAIR COCHRAN: It's been moved by Ms. Crivello and seconded by Mr. Carroll. Members, any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Any oppose, say no. Zero noes. Okay, motion carries with six ayes. . .oh, one excused, Mr. Hokama and zero noes. Thank you. And I'd like to acknowledge and recognize that Mr. White has joined us. Aloha, good afternoon Mr. White.

COUNCILMEMBER WHITE: ...(inaudible). .. Chair.

VOTE: AYES: Chair Cochran, Vice-Chair Crivello, and

Councilmembers Carroll, Couch, Guzman, and White.

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: None.

EXC.: Councilmember Hokama.

MOTION CARRIED.

ACTION: ADOPTION of resolution and FILING of communication by

C.R.

ITEM NO. 11(1): COMMITTEE'S PRIORITIES AND PROCEDURES;

PRESENTATIONS FROM COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES (ORIENTATION WORKSHOP BY THE DEPARTMENT

OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT)

CHAIR COCHRAN: All righty. So that was the first agenda item. And next we will be. . .IM-11(1) [sic]. This is in regards to Committee's Priorities and Procedures; Presentations From County Administration [sic] Agencies (Orientation by the Department of Environmental Management). And as the Committee will recall, we last reviewed the organization of the Department and

February 11, 2013

current efforts in wastewater reclamation and solid waste management at the Infrastructure Management Committee meeting of July 30, 2011. So today's presentation will update us on the current status of these programs, and I trust that this will be of particular value to the new members of the Committee also. Today we have Director and Deputy Director of Environmental Management to present the update and respond to any questions that the Members may have. And at this point I will. . Director, do you have any opening comments before we set the room for your presentation?

MR. GINOZA: No thank you.

CHAIR COCHRAN: No. Okay, so Members, we shall have a brief recess to set the room for presentation. . . . (gavel). . .

RECESS: 1:42 p.m. RECONVENE: 1:44 p.m.

CHAIR COCHRAN: (gavel). . . Will the Infrastructure and Environmental Management meeting please reconvene. We have Director Kyle Ginoza to present a PowerPoint. Mr. Ginoza.

MR. GINOZA: Thank you, Chair, for the opportunity to update this Committee on our current efforts for this Department, the Department of Environmental Management. The Department is comprised of an administrative office and two operating Divisions, the Wastewater Reclamation Division and the Solid Waste Division. I'll proceed to give a brief overview of each Division and touch upon the recently approved Charter amendment affecting the Department. So I'd like to start off with the Wastewater Reclamation Division. So this is kind of a schematic of what happens for our County system. As an example, from the residence or business, wastewater enters the County gravity line system through a series of gravity sewer lines, pump stations, force mains, and the wastewater arrives at one of our five treatment plants in the County. As you can see, we have roughly 210 miles of gravity sewer line, 24 miles of force main, and 42 pump stations. After going through the treatment process at our treatment plants, the treated effluent is disposed of in two primary ways: as recycled water and via injection wells. Last year, the approximate percentage of recycled water use in our County system was 32 percent, and the balance was disposal through the injection wells. This map shows, and it's kind of hard to see on the screen, but this map shows where our service areas for the County wastewater system are. We have treatment facilities on Maui in Kahului, Kihei and Lahaina, as well as on Lanai and on Molokai, one plant each. We also handle the collection system, so the gravity lines and force mains and pump stations in the area serving those treatment facilities. In two areas of the County, namely in Haliimaile and in Kualapuu, we also handle, we just handle the collection system. The pond-based treatment systems in these areas are handled privately. There are four global performance measures for the Wastewater Reclamation Division. First, we're continuing to look for opportunities to increase reliability of existing systems. This is primarily accomplished through, by ensuring that the sewer infrastructure is sufficiently maintained and replaced through a comprehensive capital improvement program, and through utilizing efficient electromechanical equipment throughout our facilities. Second, we have been exploring the expansion of our wastewater system to areas that are currently not connected to our sewer. Of

February 11, 2013

course, this is a rather expensive endeavor as it forces users to connect to our system and eliminates the use of their existing wastewater, individual wastewater system. We're also looking for opportunities to increase the volume of recycled or reclaimed water use. challenge has been that sewer users subsidize the use of recycled water so there are tradeoffs Lastly, as regulating agencies, such as the Federal with recycled water expansion. Environmental Protection Agency, and the State Department of Health, enact more stringent treatment requirements, we have been continuing to explore ways to improve the quality of our treated effluent. All in all, though, our primary objective remains to keep it in the pipes. I'd like to take a few minutes to discuss wastewater user fees, basically the sewer bill. Wastewater is funded 100 percent by user fees for the operation, maintenance and replacement. Put simply, as the 210 miles of gravity sewer, 24 miles of force main, 42 pump stations and 5 treatment plants need replacing, sewer user fees pay for them. That is in addition to the costs of operation and And because of pumping and treatment activities in particular, it is worth mentioning that electricity use for wastewater treatment is significant. The sewer user rates are based on water usage and also factors in non-sewer uses such as irrigation. In other words, we realize that not all water usage by a customer is in fact entering our sewer system. Sewer user fees are based on user classes being charged a proportionate share of costs and based on the kind The sewer rate model used is evaluated yearly based on the actual of sewer discharge. discharges to our treatment facilities experienced. The bottom line is the sewer bill may seem high since it accounts for 100 percent of the cost for operation and maintenance, as well as to pay down capital improvement program debt service. I'd also like to explain about the potential relocation of the Kahului, Wailuku-Kahului Wastewater Treatment Facility in Kanaha. We've explored opportunities for a public-private partnership in this potential endeavor. Based on updated information last year, a facility relocation would entail a roughly 220 million to 270 million dollar project. To finance a project like that, we're looking at monthly sewer bills going from roughly \$60, 58.45, to about \$100 a month. That's Countywide. In addition to those costs, the annual operating cost would increase depending on the type of treatment technology used and the amount of pumping that would be required to get to the relocated facility. I'd like to note that the existing facility in Kanaha has been designed to withstand a 20-foot tsunami, and we have invested approximately \$28.8 million within the last decade for that purpose. The bottom line is shall we pay over \$40 per month throughout the County for what may be termed as tsunami insurance? The Solid Waste Division is also within the Department. The Solid Waste Division is comprised of an administrative office with four major sections under it, namely Landfill, Residential Refuse Collection, Recycling, and Abandoned Vehicles and Metals. The solid waste program relies on a sizeable General Fund subsidy. This year, the General Fund subsidy is approximately \$6.6 million or approximately 26 percent of the budget. There are many reasons for this subsidy. Landfill costs are roughly 80, 98 dollars per ton, not including landfill development and post closure costs. And the tipping fee is \$71, so that's how much revenue we get. Residential refuse collection costs roughly \$40 per month, but the fee to residents is \$18 a month. In addition, residents can dump at the landfill for free, both for municipal solid waste and greenwaste. There are also costs associated with shipping recyclable materials overseas. The bottom line is, because there are alternatives to disposing waste, it is difficult for waste management to be self-sufficient. In 2009, the Department completed the Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan. A few of the key recommendations to consider are as follows: to increase the Central Maui landfill lifespan through diversion efforts, to work toward

February 11, 2013

60 percent landfill diversion by implementing a residential curbside recycling program, and by enacting laws to force businesses to recycle food waste and other materials. The plan also advocated the implementation of a proven technology waste conversion facility. What we have found to date is that diversion efforts have significant costs. For example, the major recycling effort on the island is the recycled material community drop box program. So basically it starts off here where residents basically, what we call source separate. They separate, you know, the cans from the bottles, from the cardboard, newspaper, et cetera. And so this is a picture of somebody's garage with it all source separated. The resident then takes it over to one of our residential drop box, community drop boxes, so like at UHMC or in Kihei, et cetera, where we then have a hauler take it, take that drop box to a recycled material processor, who then sorts it, bales it and then ships it. And then the current location is we ship it to China, because basically the processor looks at, you know, where they can get the most revenue. So the out-of-pocket costs to the County for this diversion program is roughly \$303 per ton for the hauling, processing and shipping, less the revenue that they get from the Chinese. So that is on top of the effort it took the resident to sort out and deliver the materials to the drop box center. So to increase recycling efforts, residential curbside recycling is currently being explored. So that's where, you know, as a result of this effort, we would increase the recycling. We found that, you know, basically each resident would get two additional bins to collect mixed recyclables and green waste. Instead of two pickups for trash per week, pickups for trash would be cut to once per week to accommodate the curbside program. The County then, through the County truck, we deliver the recycled material to a processor. And since it's all mixed up, that processor then has to separate the materials into ones that there's a market for and ones that basically would then be diverted to the landfill. And from there a similar process of once it's processed and baled, it's shipped overseas to China. So for that one, the out-of-pocket cost to the resident is roughly we feel about \$80 per year per account. So getting to the curbside recycling pilot program, it was started in August of last year in approximately 1,750 households in Kihei. The overall result of this effort was an increase in recycling. We found that, through this effort, the sizeable project implementation costs associated with the cart themselves, cart delivery to the residences, advertising, ongoing education, staffing, audits, and material processing and shipment. So as I previously mentioned, the recyclable materials are all shipped overseas, and none of the material is currently recycled in Hawaii. And the process is basically ship it overseas to the, to the markets paying the most for that commodity. So we estimated the ten-year amortized costs of the curbside recycling program to be approximately \$80 per year per account or an over 35 percent increase in the current bill. So to pay for the program, if it was just the refuse bill paying for it, or residents paying through their refuse bill, would be increased from \$216 to about \$300 per year with curbside recycling. And we have found that there are obviously pros and cons to the program. Some of the benefits are increased recycling since it's more convenient, and jobs are created to process the materials. Some of the drawbacks are increased costs, refuse pickups are cut in half, residents must accommodate three total carts at their residence, and it will hurt a longtime local business that currently handles curbside recycling. So just to give you a little bit of background on them, Maui Recycle Service has been around for, I think 23 years, and currently has every-other-week residential curbside service. However, unlike the County, they also take glass, old electronics, batteries and other materials. And they've stated to me that their service has been negatively impact by the pilot program, 'cause as you can imagine, when we put the pilot program in Maui Meadows and along the other route in Kihei, they lost some customers

February 11, 2013

as a result. But the upshot of this program is that it increases recycling, but also costs. I'd also like to briefly discuss the waste conversion effort that we've been pursuing. Waste conversion, in a nutshell, is converting trash into a resource, such as fuel or energy. The basic process involves receiving the municipal solid waste, or MSW. So trucks would collect the MSW from residences or from businesses and then dump it into an area until it's used. The trash then goes through a process of sorting out recyclable materials and inert materials, since there is value to recyclable materials and no value to the conversion process for inert materials. So there is a presort that occurs at the front end of the process. After sorting, the waste is shredded and dried, most often to create what is termed refuse derived fuel or RDF. The two basic ways that RDF is basically used is either in fluff form, basically just a mixed form. Or another way is through what they call pelletizing the RDF, or making what almost looks like my beagle's doo doo. And so it's a lot easier to transport when it's like that. The RDF could then be sent to use at a power generation facility, or it could be sent as a fuel to an existing user of coal or oil for fuel. So, you know, basically sometimes the process ends here where they provide this fuel to facilities to displace their coal or oil use. Or sometimes they take it and have another facility, either a mass burn facility or a gasification facility, pyrolysis facility. I mean, basically there's various technologies to take it from here to creating electricity, generating electricity. But, in a nutshell, the conversion process results in over 80 percent landfill diversion. So like the curbside recycling program, there are pros and cons to this what we term integrated waste conversion and energy project. So, you know, some of the pros are, you know, there's 80 to 90 percent landfill diversion. There's also islandwide recycling where, as I mentioned, in the front end, you know, most of that recyclable materials are sorted out from the municipal solid waste. From the proposals that I've reviewed, it looks like it'll result in lower solid waste management costs as well as the end product would be clean, renewable fuel or energy. And by creating renewable energy on island, it increases sustainability, however you term that. And it's a lower environmental impact than significantly under our current processes. It also creates jobs both short-term construction employment, as well as long-term operational jobs. A couple of the drawbacks would be from the reduction of existing County funded programs, and from some materials being used for waste conversion instead of recycling. So like papers, for instance. You know, from this mixed process, a lot of papers would be soiled, so it couldn't be recycled back as paper. So instead it would be shredded up to be that refuse-derived fuel. But all in all, the waste conversion project will be privately funded if pursued. So I'd like to give you an update of the status of the waste conversion project. So we received 20 proposals by the deadline at the end of last month. We're now in the process of reviewing and rating the proposals. And we'll conduct interviews with the highest ranked proposals if we feel it is necessary for clarification. The selected proposer would then be evaluated against the County's current waste management processes. But after preliminary review of the proposals, the project suggests that, as I mentioned, reduced solid waste management costs. So, in the coming months, we'll be better able to explain what we got from the proposals and which proposal we selected. So I'd like to kind of finish off having a brief presentation on the Charter amendment that was passed at the last election that will impact this Department. So the Charter amendment basically said or stated guide efforts to optimize opportunities for environmental, natural resource protection, sustainability, conservation and restoration. And so, you know, we had to kind of figure out what that meant to the different voters. So, in informally surveying various people, basically the goals seem to fall into three categories. One was, when they look in the phone

February 11, 2013

book, you know, on environmental issues, they would call us and a lot of our efforts were limited to sewer and trash. So it was a matter of getting more information out to the public in other areas that are not necessarily within our purview. So, you know, up to now, we've been trying to direct people to appropriate places like, you know, with air quality issues to the State Department of Health and such. And so we're creating a database to make sure that, you know, we have that information readily available. What we've also found is people, even when we did have people go to these different agencies, they felt that the stewardship of these peoples' responsibilities, like if it's like a private runoff concern, or a County, State or Federal responsibility. If that responsibility wasn't met, you know, they'd call us and say oh, can you help out? So that was kind of the second thing. And the third thing was just to get the consolidation of resources with regards to these kinds of efforts in one location in the Department. So some functions that's currently within the Department to kind of meld that with efforts that are currently being handled by staff and grants in the Mayor's office, for instance. So it was more of a consolidation of resources to try to get greater efficiency. So that's kind of, I wanted to kind of put it out there that we could try to have a discussion on that as we try to prepare the budget for the Fiscal '14 budget. So that's kind of what we're, along those lines we were thinking. So in summary, you know, as I just stated, the Department's efforts are quite multi-faceted. You know, we, the Wastewater Division, Wastewater Reclamation Division basically looks for, strives for efficient wastewater management and the pursuit of increased treated effluent reuse or recycled water reuse. For solid waste, they focus on increased diversion activities and the exploration of waste conversion for waste resource reuse. And lastly, you know, we're trying to ensure environmental stewardship and access to available information and resources. And basically, the bottom line of this is that we feel that the disposition of waste resources within the County will change in the near future. Thank you.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you, Director Ginoza. Members, at this point we shall have a brief recess to reset the room. . . . (gavel). . .

RECESS: 2:06 p.m. RECONVENE: 2:07 p.m.

CHAIR COCHRAN: ...(gavel)... Will the Infrastructure and Environmental Management Committee please come to order. Thank you, Director Ginoza, for the presentation.

MR. GINOZA: Thank you.

CHAIR COCHRAN: And Members, at this time I shall open the floor up for discussion, questions or anything you might have. And, oh, first of all, welcome, Mr. Hokama.

COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Aloha, and also notating that Rob Parsons from Mayor's office, Environmental Management coordinator, is in attendance with us also. Mr. Hokama.

COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: Oh. Thank you.

February 11, 2013

CHAIR COCHRAN: Yes.

- COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: Thank you. I appreciate the presentation from the Department, Chair. I thought they gave us some very good general comments about their various components. And, of course, the one that caught my eye, Director, was on Page 8, 9. And we're talking about your waste-to-energy proposal. I find it interesting that one of the cons is reduction of existing County funded programs. See, to me, that's good stuff.
- MR. GINOZA: Well, I figured just some people would feel like they like those programs. I feel like you.
- COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: But, you know, the days of cotton candy and all those handouts is gone. You know, we don't have that kind of monies anymore. So if I get there, and I know you're reviewing your submittals. So if I'm asking an inappropriate question, please give guidance or, you know, Corp. Counsel can give guidance. But, Chair, do you mind if I bring up that waste-to-energy component now, or do you prefer we talk about it later in your meeting?
- CHAIR COCHRAN: No. That's fine, Mr. Hokama. Yeah. And we can just all chime in if we have questions we want on waste to energy at this point. That's fine.
- COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: Okay. Thank you. You know, I read some of your general parameters and, you know, you're looking for... I understand why we wanna some proven technology, but you and I know technology's moving pretty rapid, so what might be the cutting edge today, by the time we look at maybe contracting somebody, that could be pretty much old stuff. So how, what is the general approach for the Department when you look at the new technologies? Because for me, just to let you know, my assumption is I don't feel we have to pay anybody to do this project. I expect positive revenue to the County, not expenditures from the County. Either from the provider or from the byproducts of the processing, yeah, whether it be fuel, whether it be hydrogen, whether it be some other type of material, we selling energy to the utility or we might sell it to ourselves if we take over the utility, and make them just a distribution entity that they used to be in the past. And so, you know, I bring this up because, you know, one of the advantages of us being a NACo member is that we do know that the DOD is doing, right now, advanced, cutting edge technology in this field, particularly in Sacramento. And so, would those type of technologies be open to this type of consideration or, you know, 'cause I don't think they'll meet the three-year requirement because they're so brand new. But the defense is moving ahead and constructing and operating these new technologies already.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Yeah, go ahead, Director.

MR. GINOZA: So, when I...to give you a little bit of background, when I initially kind of, when we initially embarked on this project, we thought the same, that the risk to the County is minimized by having it privately financed and owned and operated. But as we kind of went along, and well, maybe step a little bit back. I'm, as my nature, quite risk adverse. I don't know if it's because my dad's a CPA, so he's like risk adverse in everything.

February 11, 2013

COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: We won't hold that against you.

MR. GINOZA: But, you know, so I went in kind of thinking ah, what's the harm? But then as I kind of went through and researched the field, there is, there is the harm of going along basically just reaching for something that has prospects versus something that's proven. And basically, I developed that after having how many people come in saying, Mr. Ginoza, I can get you in this project on the ground floor. Nobody else in the world has this technology, and you can be the pioneer. And I would say probably 75 percent of the people I've met said hey, you know what, we don't have any reference facilities, but that's what, but because of that, you can come in on the ground floor. And I actually visited one of these type facilities that just so happened when I went there, they were down for scheduled maintenance. And I didn't see how a facility could be down when a potential customer is there to look at their facility. Then I kind of researched more and found there's more to it than just doing a facility. And there's kind of two things that kind of complicate matters in this, in this realm of technology, of waste conversion technology. One is what would be termed scale-up risk, so something that can be done at the one to four or five ton level may not be as scalable to the 150, 200, 500 ton level. And so I've seen that a lot of these kinds of experimental ones have a lot of prospect to be something to be prosperous, but at this point in time it would be hard for me to endorse that to this body knowing the risk involved. The other thing is a lot of these technologies are really workable at a, when the input, the feedstock is more of a homogenous nature, so like if all of it was plastic, or all of it was, you know, some, some homogenous feedstock. But when you got something like mixed municipal solid waste, that complicates matters more than the scalability risk. And so that's kind of the things I was looking at, was we could go. . .because we're not investing anything, we could, say Richelle's program might be the one we like, and we might be at the ground level with her, but I didn't wanna be five years later and we still trying to help her get that ground level project and be frustrated.

COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: Oh, I understand your...

MR. GINOZA: So that was kind of the logic. And we limited it to two because we didn't want to have to get a 20-, 30-year old technology. But I felt like two was the bare minimum because, you know, hopefully they would get the bugs out. And I kind of look at it like, like the whole Boeing 787 thing. You know, even a established market leader can run into issues with rolling out something new. And that was really our concern was do we go through the growing pains as the first customer when there may be more established technologies that has a foothold somewhere else?

COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: No, I would agree. I mean, Mayor Kenoi's watching what we do because he doesn't wanna be first, and six years ago, the so-called technology at that point that the Council decided not to go was gonna cost the County to put up \$125 million. Okay. Five, six years it's changed whereby now, I expect five to ten million dollars of net positive revenue to the County, in my projections. But I understand your, you know, your safety issue of the reliability of the technology, and I would say I wouldn't wanna be first. And that is why, you know, I'm thinking look at what the DOD guys are already put up, built and running for one year

February 11, 2013

already, you know, and that now they're willing to build the second plant. It's gotta be something if they gonna move to the second plant, you know, in West Sacramento. So I just bring that up because, again, with my colleagues who are much more into the technology advantages of these tools we have, you know, I'm looking like you. You know, reduce the cost, get some money back, reduce General Fund considerations, too, for transfers, and if hopefully, you know, make it whereby it makes a resident really have to think ten times for them to throw away illegal rubbish, you know, because it doesn't make sense anymore to go through all that effort and potentially get taken to jail for those type of violations.

MR. GINOZA: Well, what we've also found is the newer technology is like the kind of gasification. Typically, it costs, you know, it adds a cost of like, just the gasification plant may add another fifty to sixty million in cost. And that, you know, that kind of cost is kind of cost prohibited for a project like this; whereas, you know, with like Department of Defense, they got all the money in the world to get rid of waste in the forward areas.

COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: Not anymore.

- MR. GINOZA: That's what our experience had been when we initially met with some DOD type projects was, you know, their main concern is not having that footprint when they're in a forward area. So they're willing to pour money into an installation to have that waste management solution. And so as we try to translate it into a municipal use, that's where a lot of times it doesn't mesh quite well yet because it's such an immersion technology. So then you kind of get to the point of okay, do we wait five or ten years until that kind of technology is developed and it might not be, or let's see at this point in time who has something that may be a solution. So we went from just doing kind of a cast our net wide and just see how many people might come up with a solution, to okay, we make kind of minimum requirements that we feel are justified to get something that we feel can be executed and that can be implemented by the County or for the County. So that's kind of the logic we used.
- COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: And one, just one last follow-up. This type of projects, if we did have consent decree issues, we could put the monies from those type of decrees into this type of technology to satisfy either the court or a prevailing plaintiff for the County to move forward and not do, you know, traditional old style of landfills and?
- MR. GINOZA: Typically, as part of consent decrees, the EPA likes to see what they call supplemental environmental projects, or SEPs. But what they don't like was when it's a project the County already planned to do, and they just, we just using the funding that we were gonna do, use anyway to satisfy a consent decree. And so I would say that because we're kind of going along this path already, unless the, some kind of consent decree comes about very shortly, we might be, we might have analyzed it too much to be part of a consent decree. I don't know. Maybe Ms. Thomson can elaborate better.
- MS. THOMSON: No. I am, I agree with that. And as a follow-up, one of the benefits to a project like this though is, you know, increasing the lifespan of the landfill itself, decreasing the, you know, the methane that's coming off the landfill, using it for something beneficial rather than flaring it,

February 11, 2013

so there are a lot of environmental benefits that may prevent us from getting into some kind of issue with the regulatory agencies.

- COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: So no matter what, either we or a, one of the proposers gonna have to build a MRF, 'cause ...(inaudible)..., there's gotta be some source separation, yeah, of the material. I mean, like maybe the military base you know, they can order their people to put things in a certain manner. But you know how our residents and visitors are.
- MR. GINOZA: So the proposals do have a front end, most of them do have a front end MRF that would be a private facility, not a County facility, where the MRF would basically, as I mentioned in the presentation, sort out the recyclable materials that they can then take to market, as well as it sorts out the inert materials, like the concrete, rocks and such that basically just pass through the conversion process, so it's of no value. So you might as well take all of that out. So it's not that this is in lieu of recycling. It just, it really helps it because you doing, you not sorting in the front end, but you sorting everything that comes through. So instead of just certain households having the ability to, this one we sorting everything that's coming in. Well, not we, but the entity will.

COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: Right. And that would automatically reduce tipping fees, you think?

MR. GINOZA: So the revenues would be tip fees, the recyclable material revenue, the, you know, like even metals revenue. And then whatever fuel or energy that they produce in the back end. That's what makes it financeable, that you got that added stream of, that added revenue stream at the back end that helps to pay down the debt that they would incur. And so, you know, that's been probably the most interesting part of the project, is to try to find the fuel or energy taker at the back end. You know, I mean I'm sure you've seen the press recently about our discussions with MECO. And tomorrow at the energy, Councilmember Guzman's Energy Committee I wanted to elaborate. But if you wanted me to elaborate now, I can too about what's happening with that.

COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: Well, if it's pertinent to the subject matter that, you know, Chair Cochran has, you know, but if not, I can wait for Mr. Guzman's Committee.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's up to you guys.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Now? Please share, Mr. Ginoza.

MR. GINOZA: So basically with a project like this, we're looking for it to be privately financed. And so they're reliant on defined revenue streams to reduce risk. So one defined revenue stream is the tip fee that we charge. You know, we, they know it's a guaranteed revenue stream, that we're gonna charge a tip fee and they're gonna get it, or they're gonna get some portion of that. They know, you know, for these like recyclable materials or metals, a rough revenue stream from that. But perhaps the second biggest, or maybe even the biggest revenue stream, is the end product of the waste conversion, which is either the fuel or the energy. And for the energy side of it, or even with the fuel, they wanna be able to sell 100 percent of what they produce. And it'd be guaranteed that they get the 100 percent. And so the challenge we've had, and just based

February 11, 2013

on the supply and demand of energy use on the island, and the amount of existing intermittent renewable energy we have, you know, with wind, and PV solar and such, is that the challenge is being considered base load power or must run power, where we would be able to provide MECO power 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Because that's what helps make the project financeable, that, you know, if it's what they call dispatchable or intermittent power, then they're not gonna know if they're gonna get revenues of x million dollars or x million dollars divided by two because they can only run half of the day. So that's been the challenge. It's not that MECO does not want our power, period, it's the challenge of trying to figure out a way to get deemed base load power, which would make the project financeable or not. I mean, that's, that's the crux of the issue. And that's why we also looked at a fuel as being the potential end product instead of electricity. And so that was actually the, as complicating a matter as what you briefly mentioned earlier, was the two reference facilities. We looked at it not being a energy project specifically because there may be this issue of curtailment. So we looked for solutions that did not necessarily connect 100 percent to the grid, but also had the ability to either create a fuel, like how I showed the RDF, refuse derived fuel. So one way, one potential solution for instance is we could make RDF and sell it to H-Power, you know, because they have the capacity and they could use the RDF. Or some other generating facility like, I don't know, like HC&S or MECO or something, where it utilizes the existing power generation infrastructure and then we're just providing the fuel. So we wanted to leave open that, the ability to do that, knowing the potential constraints with being deemed base load power. So that's, that's really what complicated this project and what really made it where we got 20 bidders than, rather than 200 bidders, because where the industry is going and because almost everywhere else they can use the power, you know, it's, I wanna do a waste conversion to generate electricity. There'll be two components of it. It's processing the waste and power generation. That's a package deal for a waste conversion facility. And so in this case, it's a little bit of a different dynamic that maybe we stop at the first stage, and then rely on existing power generation infrastructure. Or maybe not, if we can figure out a solution to this base load discussion. But that's kind of where we're at. I mean, we just had a meeting with MECO to just, to continue to foster that discussion. But it's hard knowing the constraints that they have with needing to run their units at a certain base load, as well as, you know, the 73 megawatts of wind that are online, as well as the PV. And it's just the timing of it makes it difficult, knowing that the off-peak demand when, you know, is limited compared to what supply we have. And so that's the question, is during the off-peak times, can we sneak in there, or are we just relegated to the high-demand times?

COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: Okay. So are we kind of in sync with what the updating for the IRP is going through right now? Because would be interesting, here we going down this path, but the IRP and all this new input for the update is kinda steering a different direction. So, I mean, I'm sure you guys keeping up with the IRP.

MR. GINOZA: So the indications from their AOS, adequacy of supply document from last year, are that what they want is not base load power, but they want a peaking unit. And, you know, I mean I don't wanna speak for MECO, but that's kind of what I gather from their documentation. So a peaking unit is a dispatchable unit, that when they need power, we provide it. And when they don't need power, don't provide any power. And so that's the, that's a situation where it would be hard to finance a waste conversion project because you don't know what your major

February 11, 2013

revenue stream would look like, not knowing how much it might be curtailed. And so that's where this project largely deviates from the IRP and their adequacy of supply or their current situation, where they may look for more renewable power as a peaking unit as compared to renewable power as a firm base load unit. So that's where we're continuing discussions with them, to try to get a better understanding of where we might work together to accommodate their needs as well as to accommodate our needs of, basically for us, we don't wanna have to finance it, knowing the risks. I mean, that's kind of, like I had mentioned in a previous Council meeting, you know, that's kind of where we're at. Do we pay for it and we shoulder the risk, or do we pay a little bit more in the cost of financing, but they shoulder the risk? But what they're saying is if it's dispatchable, the cost of financing will go through the roof because your revenue stream is in question.

- COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: But the revenue stream is based on the deferred cost of fossil fuel, right? I mean, you know, that 18 cents of deferred cost, or 16 cents, whatever it is.
- MR. GINOZA: But it's still dependent on them wanting to get that electricity at that cost or whatever avoided cost they have. And that's kind of the challenge.
- COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: Yeah, but for the private provider, he's gonna, you know, tell us, maybe give us three cents below that deferred cost number, right, and they'll still make money and be able to sell cheaper than what is the current.
- MR. GINOZA: So basically that's what we're trying to have discussions with them, and we have been. And it's been quite amicable, you know, to try to work through this. You know, whereas they have certain criteria that they're looking to satisfy, you know, we have criteria that are somewhat in sync but I wouldn't say wholly in sync just based on the level of demand. Like we want a sustained level of demand, and they want an intermittent supply in large part. Yeah, so another thing that Richelle just brought up, that with the kind of waste conversion technology that you use the power generation units for, it's not something like a diesel or gasoline engine where ah, I'm not using my car anymore, let me turn it off. I'll go get something from my fridge and come back and turn it back on. It's units that have a warm-down and warm-up cycle that often times are in the hours and hours. So, you know, if you're down, it doesn't make sense to be down for like eight hours at night, because it takes them awhile to warm down and then warm up again. And so, for them, that's why the technology is such that you don't wanna cycle it. You just want it on and only will go down when you gotta do maintenance. So it's a different kind of technology and different engine kind of unit than what we're used to in the consumer section.
- COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: So maybe we gotta wait for technology to catch up on generation equipment then. That seems to be the problem, inability to just turn it on and off. Well I think you brought up some interesting points for us to consider and I appreciate my opportunity, Chair.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you, Mr. Hokama. Mr. Couch.

February 11, 2013

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Thank you, Madam Chair. Boy, I mean, as you're talking, I'm writing down more and more questions here. First of all, you talked about the base load. Their base load right now is fossil based, right? Fossil fuel based?

MR. GINOZA: Yeah.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: And they wanna keep that when we have the option to give them non-fossil fuel based base load? Is that what the, what I hear you saying?

MR. GINOZA: Part of, oh.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Go ahead, Director.

MR. GINOZA: Part of where my, and this is my understanding. I'd rather they kind of speak for themselves, but my understanding from my discussions with them is they have, like, diesel combustion turbines that they, that create the supply for them. And to run it at like a minimum, you might run it at say 20 megawatts, but it has a capability to go to 100. And so in case wind just dies to, you know, in a minute, that they have that capability. So for us to replace a unit like that would be difficult when our, our full capacity is under what one of those units would be at a base load.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: So our full capacity is not the base load, it's the, it's the...

MR. GINOZA: So our full capacity may be, this project looks like on the order of 10 to 12 to 15 megawatts.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Oh. Okay.

MR. GINOZA: So it's, say, 10 to 15 megawatts. And so we cannot replace one of those turbines.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: We'd have to get something around 20 that can go all the way up to 100.

MR. GINOZA: Plus, I mean, because it has to accommodate for if something happens to the existing renewable supply.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Okay.

MR. GINOZA: So it has to be able to ramp up. And that's why they look for peaking units where oh, something happened. Let me turn on a peaking unit to be able to supply that, the amount of power they need. And so you know, that's kind of the complication, is the amount we have is not enough to displace an existing unit.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Right.

February 11, 2013

Mr. GINOZA: And so...

- COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: That's makes a little more sense. I thought we were able to at least come up with the base load. Okay. You mentioned that, you kept saying, when we're doing waste-to-energy, part of this, their revenue stream is tipping fees. Does that mean we're gonna pay them tipping fees as well?
- MR. GINOZA: So the, kind of the model we have is we would control the scale house. We currently control the scale house for, at the Central Maui Landfill. So commercial haulers would pay us at the land...basically pay the County, you know, during their monthly bills, for the tip fee and then whatever portion of that is, whatever they, say the developer, Don Couch's Waste-to-Energy facility, we'll pay Don Couch, you know, \$50 out of the \$70, or whatever it is. So it would be some percentage of the tip fee that we charge would go to the facility as basically a fee to deal with the waste.
- COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Okay. And say we get this whole waste-to-energy thing going and it's everybody's dream project, and we get between 80 and 90 percent diversion, landfill diversion. That 80, 90 percent, does that include the stuff we get from curbside recycling, or would this then end curbside recycling, if we were to do waste-to-energy.
- MR. GINOZA: I think that's the kind of decision that has to be made in the front end because, you know, that takes out revenue stream from the provider if we all of a sudden do islandwide curbside. And so that's kind of, that's the reason why I wanted to have a discussion--I appreciate Ms. Cochran putting this before you today--is to me we really, as a County, have to make that decision. It's kind of mutually exclusive. You can have both, but you reduce the efficiencies of one if you have the other.
- COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: But essentially you're doing, since there is a MRF there and they are pulling out the recyclables that they can make money off of, then you are doing recycling.
- MR. GINOZA: Exactly. And that's what I told them has to be a major component.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Okay.

- MR. GINOZA: That, you know, we don't wanna see everything burned or done. . .basically we want to see recycling continue.
- COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Okay. And lastly, these technologies, you know, Mr. Hokama took the first question there. Are there technologies within this two-year or three-year period that are close to, if not, zero emission?
- MR. GINOZA: Well, I don't know of zero emission. I mean, basically any facility can be, you know, the air can be scrubbed to be low emission, right. I mean, it's just a matter of how much money you put into the back end filtration system to reduce the emissions. And so yeah, a lot of these newer technologies, they, you know, unlike mass burn where you're just basically torching the

February 11, 2013

whole waste stream, they do a different process to reduce the emission significantly. So there are processes that significantly reduce and it is, I mean, there's still emissions. I don't know if any are zero emission, but as compared to the amount of landfill generated methane and importation of fossil fuel, I mean if you take everything from a carbon footprint perspective, all of the projects I've looked at are a net environmental benefit, as compared to a current process. But I wouldn't say that it's zero emissions as a whole.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you, Mr. Couch and Director. Members, further discussion? Mr. White.

COUNCILMEMBER WHITE: Thank you, Chair. On the recycling pages, slides number 13 and 14 on Page 7 cost to the County on the first slide is \$303 per ton, and on the second slide with the revised method of recycling, cost to the County drops to \$80 per year per account. Is that, where are, so that's an increase in the cost, right?

MR. GINOZA: Yes.

COUNCILMEMBER WHITE: Okay. And where is the main increase in that cost?

MR. GINOZA: Well, it's two separate processes. So one is looking at the cost to the County of basically hauling and processing and shipping the material. And one is, you know, doing the curbside program, which one of the big costs there is the cost of the carts. You know, because you have to buy two carts, they roughly run about like \$80 each, so it's like \$160 first year cost if we were to do it, as well as all the other costs that I'd mentioned, like advertising, education, processing. So when you say increase in cost, increase as compared to what, as compared to the current?

COUNCILMEMBER WHITE: Well, I thought you mentioned that the cost would go up.

MR. GINOZA: Okay, so it would be as compared to our current system, which is just landfill disposal. So we have two, you know, the people who have automated have two pickups a week, and those two pickups are both refuse. In this situation, one would be refuse, and the other pickup per week would either be mixed recyclable or greenwaste. And the cost to process that, when you factor that in as well as the education program and such, the true cost would be on the order of, about an increase of \$80 per account per year. So roughly from 216, it'd go to like \$300.

COUNCILMEMBER WHITE: And we go to the integrated waste conversion, what is the impact on the annual bills?

MR. GINOZA: For, if you compare it to the refuse bills because you're not gonna do any presort or any kind of sort, it would just be what the current bill is now.

COUNCILMEMBER WHITE: Okay.

February 11, 2013

MR. GINOZA: Because now, instead of doing any kind of sorting at the consumer end, we would do it downstream at the landfill end.

COUNCILMEMBER WHITE: Okay. And when you say tipping fee, there's no tipping fee from our own refuse trucks, right?

MR. GINOZA: Yes.

COUNCILMEMBER WHITE: Yes, there isn't one, or yes...

MR. GINOZA: Oh, no. I mean that's a good point. Yes, so right now it's free. I mean we don't pay ourselves a tip fee. So that is the cost that we're analyzing against, I mean as part of the analysis, is in the existing process, we don't pay for that. So if we did a waste conversion project, we now would have to pay that facility whatever fee they're charging for our own trucks. So that's what we're factoring into the analysis. I don't know if that's what you're getting at, but yeah, it is free, and it wouldn't be free under this project.

COUNCILMEMBER WHITE: Right. So what do you estimate that to be?

MR. GINOZA: Estimate what?

COUNCILMEMBER WHITE: How many tons do our own refuse trucks take versus commercial?

MR. GINOZA: I would say it's about a third, about a third of the tonnage.

COUNCILMEMBER WHITE: That's all?

MR. GINOZA: Yeah.

COUNCILMEMBER WHITE: Wow. Seems like it would be higher. Okay. That's all I have. Thanks, Chair.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you, Mr. White. Members, further discussion? Mr. Couch.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Yeah. I'd like to move to the Charter amendment issue. I notice that we have, you discussed a little bit what the Charter says. And I know there was some talk about doing another division. But I noticed that you didn't put it in there, which is a good, I think is a good thing. You feel that you can do it without a whole division, or do you think you need another division to handle the Charter?

MR. GINOZA: That's why I have Mr. Parsons here.

CHAIR COCHRAN: All right. Mr. Parsons, comments.

February 11, 2013

MR. PARSONS: Thank you, Chair and Members. Thank you for your question, and Director Ginoza, thank you for the invitation to be here and to share my perspective on the applicability of the Charter amendment passing to the Department. And I thought the Director did a very good job of, you know, an overview of the Department and as well as the introduction to what may be coming in this direction per the Charter amendment. One of the slides you gave the language that was passed by 66 percent of the voters on the November ballot. Councilmember Crivello, as a Charter Commission member, sat through many discussions of this proposal and they reshaped the original wording of it and condensed and simplified it to something they felt that they'd like to ask the voters to address. And I know many of you have also been through some of these discussions. So the language that Director Ginoza gave you is guide efforts to optimize opportunities for environmental, natural resource protection, sustainability, conservation and restoration. And these, the other Charter amendment, were added to his powers, duties and functions as the Director of this Department. So we're in preliminary discussions with Mayor, Managing Director and Budget Director, and with the idea of establishing a new division of environmental protection sustainability because the overview of the Department seems to include environmental management of these things. But historically they've been kind of piecemeal in various other County offices and departments. So Director Ginoza used the word consolidating, and I think that's the direction that we're looking is to take efforts that are being done in the Mayor's office, in Office of Economic Development where there's a number of environmental grants that aren't an exact fit there, and I've worked closely with them for a number of years on some of those things, invasive species and watershed protection and a number of other smaller grants. And then I think as we see the community's interest, and particularly the interest with the college, with the sustainable science management program growing by leaps and bounds, there's nearly 100 people enrolled now and it's a degreed program at this point. It's a four-year program. I think this is a tremendous opportunity for us to refocus our efforts in such a way that we can really interface with the college, interface with the community, and take a lead on some sustainability initiatives.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: That was very political answer there. It kind of didn't. . .in essence, you're looking to do a new division and, at least that's what your comments were, is that right?

MR. PARSONS: If I may, Chair?

CHAIR COCHRAN: Yes, Mr. Parsons.

MR. PARSONS: Yeah, that's the direction that, you know, nothing's finalized at this point, and I actually welcome the opportunity to bring all of you into the discussion earlier now rather than to plop something down on your desk when the budget is printed and finalized. You know, so...

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Well, and Mr. Ginoza, this is, and Mr. Parsons both, you know, you're well aware of our loathe to add more positions and certainly increase government as much as possible. But I realize that the Charter amendment did say this, have this language. Would this be something that could be, I mean, you have a few people doing all this information in different, or these functions in different places. Just putting them under the administration of the, of the Environmental Management Department, as opposed to another whole division which may

February 11, 2013

require whatever it would require. Can't you just get that group of people to work underneath Mr. Ginoza's general, I mean direct, instead of coming up with a whole new division? I don't know, Mr. Ginoza, your thoughts on that.

MR. GINOZA: That, I mean, that's a good point. I mean, that's kind of where the discussion is at this point and, you know, I really wanted to have that here to kind of flesh out the different options at our disposal at this point. I mean, if you look at, now I look at it also from a kind of a flat budget perspective, where I mean, and that's why I've asked a number of people who voted in favor of this, you know, like what were you voting for? And, for me, the way I can see us from just my Department's resources, trying to address some of the issues with the residents is what I had termed that first one, information dissemination, where, you know, we, I feel my staff does an excellent job at trying to get the information out that, you know, it's not necessarily under our purview, but like I said, you know, that's kind of only a part of the battle because, as you folks are well aware, you know, there are a number of functions that aren't under our purview that aren't necessarily being met to the satisfaction of the general public, that they want the County maybe to kind of engage in, which personally, I don't see paying State government and County government for the same function. And so that's where I'd kind of like to have a discussion on I'm gonna try to bridge that gap on that first point of information dissemination to make sure. We have started creating a database of, you know, these frequently asked questions, and to make sure we're consistent and we have the numbers readily available rather than oh, hold on, let me check the phone book. So we have the information there, but like I mentioned, a lot of the people when they call back, they're like, I didn't get anything from wherever you directed me to. And that's the frustration. And that's a different issue than what Mr. Parsons is talking about, but I don't really deal, I haven't up 'til now dealt with the conservation and sustainability side of I've dealt more with okay, the phone book says Department of Environmental Management. I have a air quality issue, complained about it. I'm gonna call, you know, this number.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: And they will.

MR. GINOZA: And they call us and unfortunately, it's not under our purview. And what we do do is redirect them to the appropriate location, which at times I know it's frustrating, and yet at the same time do we as a County devote resources to an area where it's under somebody else's jurisdiction? And so that's kind of the quandary we're in and that, kind of my two cents to that from my resources that are in my Department, is to try to come up with a better informational dissemination strategy which, you know, I don't feel like we don't give out good information. It's just sometimes it takes us more time than we should.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: And I understand that. And I think that's, at least from my recollection working with Mr. Parsons before, that's kind of what he does now. So it would kind of be underneath your administration as opposed to the Mayor's office this time. And also most likely anybody else you bring in there, to have all that knowledge base instead of Mr. Parsons having to call around his colleagues in the Administration or whatever department they're in, now they're all together and they can shout over the desk hey, what about this one and, you know.

February 11, 2013

MR. GINOZA: Yeah. So from a budgetary perspective, I mean by consolidation, my assumption is that, you know, if there are currently bodies and grant money in one particular location, it would reduce that and put it in my Department if you think, I mean, if in the end we think that consolidation in this Department is more efficient. And that's kind of what we're still working toward. But it's a matter of right now, a lot of the functions that currently kind of fall along what the guide, environmental and so on, lot of them fall under the auspices of appointed positions. And so how do you get from a lot of the functions and EPs, or at least people, how do you go from they're being appointed to...

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: From appointed to Civil Service.

MR. GINOZA: Exactly. So that's kind of the nuances that we trying to work through but, you know, we still trying to get a. . .at least I'm still trying to get a handle of what everybody was voting yes for.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: And, I'm sorry, one last question. And I don't know how this works, but I would like to hear from a person who was on the Charter Commission and what her thoughts are and how that discussion went, and what their thoughts were when they came up with their final.

VICE-CHAIR CRIVELLO: If I may, Chair.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Yes, Ms. Crivello.

VICE-CHAIR CRIVELLO: If my memory refreshes, that the whole intent I think from the Charter and from the presentation from the public was to have the sustainable component in there, however you wanna define sustainable. I had my own personal opinions and not necessarily finding this to be a separate division or what necessitates it. And like what was mentioned, is the duplication that is already provided by our State government or should be put forth that way. However, it did go on before the Charter, and to be part of the environmental management position. And that's kind of where the Charter Commission went with that, Councilman Couch.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you, Ms. Crivello. And if I can just turn the floor over to Mr. Parsons, and perhaps shed more light on your behalf, Mr. Parsons, as Environmental Coordinator. What, in your mind, is the intent of that Charter amendment proposal? Did it come via Mayor's Office, yes?

MR. PARSONS: Yeah. It was one of more than a dozen proposals that came down from the Mayor's Office. And actually, there was a meeting where he addressed a number of his proposals before the Commission. And one of the commissioners, at the end of his dissertation asked him, you know, you've given us a lot of proposals, Mr. Mayor. Which one, which one is most important, or what are your top three. And this was one that he selected as being of paramount importance. And this isn't out of the blue, I mean, I've had discussions going back ten years with him, and then back to 2006 as well, when Public Works and Environmental Management were together as one large Department with five Divisions. And in 2006, that went on the ballot asking the voters

February 11, 2013

should this be split into two separate departments so there will be greater efficiency? So we grew in one sense, but I think as Kyle noted, it was in the direction of being more efficient by doing so. And at that time, a member of the Cost of Government Commission came to my office, which was located in Public Works and Environmental Management although I was still Assistant to the Mayor, I was physically located there, and he said if we're to create this new Department of Environmental Management, doesn't it seem that, that would be creating the bureaucratic structure for us to do a better job of addressing environmental protection issues. And I said yes, I think it does offer us that opportunity. But what's different this time around is that I think we have a mandate from the voters the way this Charter amendment was worded, that now gives us the opportunity to do our best job of assessing, as Kyle said, what were they saying when they voted yes, because this didn't ask the voters shall we create a new division? But I believe that the Mayor and Managing Director and Budget Director feel that, that might be the most efficient way to address the issue and the wording of the Charter.

VICE-CHAIR CRIVELLO: Chair.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you, Mr. Parsons. Ms. Crivello, followed by Mr. Hokama and Mr. Guzman.

VICE-CHAIR CRIVELLO: Thank you, Chair. I guess this is directed to Director. Because we're mandated to put this in place in accordance to the Charter, is your assessing, your process of assessing this is how you really are going to assign it? Is that what you're trying to determine, will it be a division, will it be Civil Service? Or are you trying to put a description to the need.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Director.

MR. GINOZA: Frankly, I'm still trying to figure out what. . .I'm, I guess, because of my engineering background, I'm more like goal oriented. So I wanna know like what kind of the goal is. And as I kind of mentioned, there are different levels of what guide efforts mean to me. You know, one level is information. One level is light a fire under the 'okole of other people. And one is consolidation of resources. And so I see merits to all three, and I wanted to have a discussion here before we pick out of the three and say hey, Budget Committee, we saying that we want this. And so that's kind of where I'm at, just to try to understand if you look at it from a, for me just to try brown nose to Mr. Hokama, a flat budget would be just information distribution, a better information distribution method. But, you know, I realize that there are other ways to do it and other goals and objectives. And so that's why we're continuing our discussions on the administrative side. I wanted to get input from your side and, you know, whatever we flesh out during the budget deliberations is what we'll pursue. But it's just, to me, still warrants discussion. I didn't wanna blindside you all on something that there are different levels of expectation.

VICE-CHAIR CRIVELLO: May I have a follow-up on that?

CHAIR COCHRAN: Sure, Ms. Crivello. Go ahead.

February 11, 2013

VICE-CHAIR CRIVELLO: Thank you, Chair. So how do you answer, I'm sorry, how do you answer your own question on the efficiency of consolidation?

MR. GINOZA: It's, I mean, I don't know the answer. I mean, depending on what the objectives are. I mean, you know, I feel like there are efforts within my Department that we take to, that are along the lines of sustainability or natural resource protection or, you know, that kind of stuff, just with that project that we just were discussing. And yet, I'm sure there are others in other departments. Is there efficiencies in grouping it all in one department? I'm sure there are. Are there inefficiencies? I'm sure there are as well. And so I know it's such a wishy-washy answer, but it kind of is, it's hard to say which way is better, which way is more efficient. I mean, I feel like things under my domain as far as waste, solid waste and wastewater, I think that I have a good idea of sustainability and, you know, that kind of things. Do I have a good idea of what that means in Public Works? I don't, I can't say I do. And I will defer to, you know, their technical expert or my counterpart in the Administration. And so that's why we're having the discussion now on the administrative side but, you know, absent a discussion with you, I didn't wanna hinder Mr. White's budget process by fleshing it out then. So I guess what I'm kind of appealing to you is to say we're gonna pick one of those three options at this point, so if you guys feel strongly one way or the other, it'd be good to get your input before we finally decide. And that's, that was kind of my objective today is there are plusses and minuses to all three of the stated alternatives. I'm not saying that's all the alternatives there are. So I'm kind of looking to you to say oh, maybe you found something different. I'm saying we'll be willing to consider that. Or if you feel strongly one way or the other, that's another thing we'd consider. You know, that's, that was kind of why I wanted to put it on this, have that discussion today. So I have not, to not be so long winded, I have not decided which, if it's more efficient by consolidation.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Done, Ms. Crivello? You finished, okay. Mr. Hokama.

COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: Well I think, well, first let me tell you that I appreciate you being very open and candid and asking the Committee Members for some guidance. So I appreciate that. You know, for me, I didn't like this amendment. It didn't do many things. One, it didn't do one. . .well, almost every amendment, to me, should have one cost analysis, because the taxpayer has no clue what the hell they approving when it impacts their wallets. Two, I expected one better thought-out proposal. Not for be here today telling me I get three options as their Director, and I don't know what we was supposed to do from the first get-go because it was never thought out completely from proposal, to ballot, to now. Okay. So, for me, I'm gonna tell you, I'm not into adding more divisions. I'm not adding, into more positions. I'm not into taking other governmental levels' responsibilities, either. If it's the State, it's the State, the Feds, the Feds. But I don't need for us to get into more areas of non-responsibility that eventually might end up in another tort lawyer's case against the County because we butted our nose in somebody else's kuleana. So, you know, for me, it's... And that is why it's good. Council can propose Charter amendments the next four terms and I'm planning to do some, because we gotta do this a hell of a lot better and make the voters, the taxpayers understand exactly what we asking of them. For now to ask the question, what did the voters really mean, that's a hell of a time for us to ask that question. Should be before we even put it on the ballot, what are we

February 11, 2013

gonna ask the voters. What is the cost so they know. Are they willing to pay double tipping fees? They willing to go universal and pay another 10 percent on real property taxes, because the nine of us gonna have to face that battle once we make the call. You're not gonna ask for the fee increase or the tax. The nine of us are. And dammit, that's the hell of a way for me to approach this amendment for implementation. You know, so I'm not a happy camper because I think we blindsided the taxpayers by not being upfront of all these costs that we gonna have to, now, figure out how to pay. And we never even start with the General Plan, Island Plan projects yet. We never even deal with collective bargaining yet. Never even come up with our full funding strategy for liabilities yet. So for you to come and tell me oh, we gotta implement this Charter, man, it's low on my priority list of already requirements that we are mandated to take care of from lawsuits, consent decrees and you name it, up the yin yang of all this judicial decisions that we have to do. So I'll tell you that the more frugal, better. I got no problem deferring or delaying the implementation until we come up with something we know what we agreeing to 'cause, you know, I notice we did one grant for, from OED, for axis deer. My thing is why don't we take the State to court, DLNR? Why do other people's jobs? That's not our role. We gotta do our job first. And I think we get enough to do yet that's under your mandated requirements for you to take care of, 'cause we all know you get one aging sewer system, Mr. Director, that's gonna have to be replaced with no Federal support potentially. You know, that bothers me. You know, the landfill issue. Every island has life expectancy. And that is why, before I leave, we need better projections. I cannot have your Division give me three bloody different lifespans of my Lanai landfill, and every time, you know, it's I mean... You should ask us. If you need one audit, I'm happy to audit your Division for you. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you, Mr. Hokama. Mr. Guzman, did you have...

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: Oh yeah. I just had a question for Mr. Parsons. I do realize that, you know, the State and Federal, we would be duplicating services. Is there anything that you would see that we wouldn't be duplicating? What are the needs? I mean, what exactly are the needs in this particular amendment of the Charter. I mean, I guess what I'm trying to rephrase, we know what the duties are for the State and Feds. Are there any gaps in between that we can fill in order to comply with this amendment?

CHAIR COCHRAN: Mr. Parsons.

MR. PARSONS: Chair, thank you. I see not so much duplication of what State and Federal agencies are mandated to do, but I see this as our County's ability to coordinate our efforts with their efforts. And to use an example of the axis deer, that's, you know, we've been aware of that for a long time. We've brought suggestions to the Council, we've brought suggestions to the State Hawaii Invasive Species Council, and actually we were successful in getting the State to award money for that purpose, for management of the species. And that's an example where what has fallen in my purview as Executive Assistant for Environmental Concerns is stretched very, very thin. My office is strong on its partnerships within the County, within the State, with many, many nonprofit organizations, and even with Federal agencies like NOAA and EPA. And this, I believe, would help fill a gap that we have to be able to adequately balance so many different issues with so many different agencies effectively. One of the things in the conversations I've

February 11, 2013

had with Mayor and Budget Director is well, I think you know that it's the Mayor's intention to not increase positions. So we're not here today asking for that. Ultimately, when what budget proposal does come forward to Budget Committee, I expect it to be very well explicated, explained, thought-out. This is a little preliminary today and I apologize to any of you who felt that we didn't give you, you know, exact structure of this. But truly we are asking for your voice to be a part of this as it comes to you so it can be better constructed. I hope I've answered your question there.

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: Well, it sounds like, to me, that you're trying to propose somewhat what the Economic Development has in a business resource center. Like you want, like it's the main purpose. What would be the main purpose, to protect, monitor? I'm trying to get a grasp of your goals. And is it to advocate protection, to monitor environmental protection issues, and then disseminate information and then help these people file their claims, or report these to the State and Federal guys? Because it sounds like it's more of a resource center division, or not division, or counseling that you are looking for, right? Just someone that, if a caller comes in, they've got an issue with some kind environmental problem, you just need somebody direct them to a certain way, how to file the claim, how to get ahold of certain senators or representatives to work on their issues. Is that what my understanding is?

MR. PARSONS: Chair.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. PARSONS: Thank you. That's a component of it, yes. And much as Kyle described, I handle a wide variety of calls and e-mails and things forwarded to the Mayor's Office when people are unable to find that information easily from the agency that probably is best at giving it to them. So in that essence, it really is a resource center to the entire community.

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: So we are talking like a resource.

MR. PARSONS: Well, it does have that capability, but I think that...

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: Not a monitoring type enforcement of violations and things like that.

More of a --

MR. PARSONS: No. There are agencies that are tasked with enforcement, but by and large, that's not...

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: More a counseling to those who are, you know, seeking justice for certain environmental issues. Like that.

MR. PARSONS: Well, I don't know if it that's so much what the amendment was proposing. And remember, the sustainability is a big component of this, and it's environmental protection and conservation. And, you know, I've also been following Statewide efforts that the State spent about \$1.3 million preparing a 2050 Sustainability Master Plan over a course of a few years

February 11, 2013

from 2005. And I think the final report was issued in 2007. And there was input from all the counties, from people here within Maui County, and Statewide, and came up with a series of recommendations and goals. However, there's been no continuity to that. There's never been a coordinator position established. There's never been funding to make sure that we're hitting the benchmarks that were recommended within that plan. So there is a Statewide effort. You know, I'll point out that Maui County is the only county that doesn't have a sustainability coordinator per se. I've addressed a lot of those issues because I believe it's important to us, and I think the voters also indicated that they feel it's important. You know, community organizations have sprung up, South Maui Sustainability, Upcountry Sustainability, West Side, and then the college as I said is robust and growing with interest. So, you know, I hope that we can meet this growing workforce, and I anticipate that a new division could address green jobs. You know, I guess we're doing well with renewable energy, with our energy coordinator and commissioner. And I think there's an area where you can see that a very small investment has brought us a very generous payback in overall electrical savings costs from the get-go in a very short amount of time. One thing I shared with Charter Commission is that a National Association of the Counties study in 2010 indicated that over 750 counties reporting nationwide said that of those that have a sustainability office or division, the greatest benefit was reduced cost of government. So I would say this is a small upfront investment that pays large dividends long term and allows us to more efficiently address these issues.

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: Thank you, Mr. Parsons. Did you say that all of the other counties have a sustainability commissioner?

MR. PARSONS: With the exception of the change in the Mayor and the City and County of Honolulu, I don't know if they retained that position, but I'm checking into that. I had a e-mail today to find out if Mayor Caldwell is gonna reappoint. But yeah. Kauai County, Glen Sato is their sustainability coordinator, and Freesia, she just got married, I don't remember her last name, on the Big Island in Mayor Kenoi's office.

COUNCILMEMBER GUZMAN: Thank you.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you. Mr. Couch.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Thank you, Madam Chair. That's an interesting comment you made about other islands, other counties in the State have sustainability coordinators. Do they also have environmental coordinators, or are we just naming, your position could have been a sustainability coordinator?

CHAIR COCHRAN: Go ahead, Mr. Parsons.

MR. PARSONS: Thank you. I think this raises the larger question of how a sustainability focus is incorporated into county government structure, city government, state government. There are many, many different models. I've got a pie chart that shows some are in planning, some are in the mayor's office, some as a free standing department, some in public works, some in environmental management. I personally appreciate combining environmental protection with

February 11, 2013

sustainability, because I think that inherently when we talk about sustainability, it is intelligent use long term of our available resources as a major component.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Okay. And, Madam Chair, as we look at the language again if you wanna just parse it a little bit, it's, the objective is to guide efforts to optimize opportunities in all those different areas. So I can see how information dissemination is a big part of that. But it doesn't say anywhere, you know, it's one of those things and I guess we'd like to have, or I'd like to have Corp. Counsel or Personnel Services look into this, 'cause HRS 76.77 talks about Civil Service and whatnot. If it's a, if they're employees of the department, then they probably have to be Civil Service. But if they could be employees of the Managing Director's Office, or the Mayor's Office, just happen to be quartered in Department of Environmental Management and charged with that task, that way we can keep it as an appointed position type of situation and not be forced into the whole Civil Service issue. Can we look into that and see if that's a feasible...

CHAIR COCHRAN: Mr. Ginoza, you have a comment?

MR. GINOZA: I asked that same question and of the Budget Office actually, and they had already asked Personnel Services about it. Where under the Department of Environmental Management, we can only have Director, Deputy, Secretary as the appointees, and then we couldn't have more appointees. And so the way that it would work would either be, like as you mentioned, that Mayor's Office staff would be stationed with us, or we would just have to hire civil servants. But we cannot, so for instance, that would prevent me from, if I had extra budget, just say I had extra \$20,000 in budget, appointing Richelle to do some...

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: Right. I understand that part. And you can understand our concern about adding more Civil Service positions as opposed to. So you've asked for some direction, at least I know I've heard two or three mention that division --

MR. GINOZA: Yeah and it's been helpful.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: --yeah, division isn't preferable. I don't know, Madam Chair, I don't know how, maybe this is another issue to bring up before budget if we have, do you have another meeting before budget?

CHAIR COCHRAN: I do.

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: It might be something worth to devote the whole meeting to is to discuss this, because, you know, I don't hear any discussion about saying yeah, we should have, at least from the six of us here or seven, seven of us here saying yes, we should have a division. But I hear two or three saying, prefer no divisions in that. So if we can find a way to make that work without Civil Service positions, that would be, in my opinion, the most optimal.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you, Mr. Couch. Mr. Hokama.

February 11, 2013

COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: Can we maybe have Ms. Thomson check for the Committee if, through the process and through Mr. White's Committee, if we can consider it pilot project. And, you know, we can then I would say go LTAs or limited term considerations. And if it works, we can transfer it to a more permanent status. But if it doesn't work, then for me, I got no problem putting in one Charter amendment to eliminate this from the Charter.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you.

- COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: 'Cause we gonna go on the results of the pilot project, whether it can work or not. And you and I know that most of our municipalities, not the counties, the cities either do it through public works department or through the office of the mayor. It's not a standalone on sustainability.
- CHAIR COCHRAN: Thank you, Mr. Hokama. And Ms. Richelle Thomson, did you, you took notes, I see. Okay. Thank you.
- MS. THOMSON: You're welcome.
- CHAIR COCHRAN: So in this Charter, was there a deadline in order to, you know, was there a time, no. All right.
- MR. GINOZA: Just put it in the Charter, but it doesn't specify.
- CHAIR COCHRAN: It doesn't say do this by a certain date. Okay. Members, further discussion of Department? Does anybody have any need to discuss about the wastewater aspect of DEM at this point, wastewater? Yes, Ms. Crivello.
- VICE-CHAIR CRIVELLO: Thank you, Directors. When you gave your organization under refuse collection, where does Molokai and Lanai fit, or does that come under landfill? You have Wailuku, Makawao, Lahaina under the refuse collection.
- MR. GINOZA: So Molokai is handled by Public Works does it. And then on Lanai, our landfill, one of our landfill staff does the refuse collection.
- VICE-CHAIR CRIVELLO: Okay. Thank you.
- CHAIR COCHRAN: Mr. Ginoza, I had a question in regards to Kahului Wastewater. Is there ever a discussion about upgrading it for R1 utilization there?
- MR. GINOZA: Yes. And based on I believe a year, it was either last year or this fiscal year or the previous fiscal year, you had put in some money to investigate that. So we're finishing up that study so we can provide, if you wanna, the next time we have this kind of meeting, I can provide that input. So what we looked at was the ability or what it would take to upgrade the Kahului treatment plant to have R1, as well as to look at if we wanted to do a different, another regional treatment plant, like say in the South Maui, or not South Maui, but like the Maalaea port, you

February 11, 2013

know, that to serve development toward that area. So that's kind of what we're looking at is if we do continue with centralized plants, you know, what it would take for another plant in that area as well as to look at what it would take to get R1 at Kahului.

- CHAIR COCHRAN: Right. Because we did bring up the discussion of relocation, and so what would be most, you know, feasible.
- MR. GINOZA: From a cost perspective, I mean, we have been, you know, we spent almost \$30 million trying to fortify the existing plant. And the challenge has been and will be to find users in that area, because, you know, the most likely user would be somebody like HC&S. But to get through all of civilized Kahului to get the line there is one thing, as well as we need to provide the water at their cost. And so since their water is almost free, we'd have to provide the water to them at that level as well. But considering some things that we have in our water, like chlorides, they only wanted like on the seed cane side of it in Maalaea rather than for the more mature cane. So there are some issues that come into play as we try to look for users. But that, yeah, if you wanna talk about it the next time, I'd be happy to.
- CHAIR COCHRAN: Yeah. Thank you, Director. Members, further discussion on the matters today? So I just wanna say thank you for being here for my first meeting of the term. And kind of unfortunately I am only limited to one meeting per month. So I have one more before budget, March 11th.

COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: Chair.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Yes.

COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: I'm happy to work with you if you need some maybe additional time.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Excellent.

- COUNCILMEMBER HOKAMA: I will try and adjust my Committee's scheduling and try to accommodate your request.
- CHAIR COCHRAN: Well, I really, really appreciate that, Mr. Hokama, because I've sort of been debate, you know, in a battle in trying to figure out how to prioritize and itemize my agenda because I have such limited time. And so the questions that we brought up today I would love to vet out and continue, you know --

MR. GINOZA: I'd love that, too.

CHAIR COCHRAN: --you folks coming here. But again, with one meeting, but thank you, Mr. Hokama, for that recommendation. I'm sure I will be taking you up on that. So we can discuss that. And also, I just wanted to bring up the point that I believe Mr. Ginoza, you're also asked to come to Mr. Guzman's meeting tomorrow, in relation to solid waste discussion once

February 11, 2013

again. And I just wanna say that this Committee has always been charged with environmental management, you know, having to do with the operations aspect, wastewater, of course, and landfill issues. And the whole waste-to-energy project really came from trying to address our landfill, the finite landfill areas, you know, space that's there and how to deal with curbside, and there was the recycling aspects of waste, and sort of the byproduct of this discussion led to utilizing waste for energy. But when energy really wasn't the big topic, you know, it didn't, that's not what brought that agenda item, you know, to light. So I just wanted to maybe if there's any, you know, concerns or questions in the air about why this is here in this particular department, Committee, that's primarily the reason why. And again, I'm very focused on Public Works issue, and a lot of Environmental Management issues, and this is why my Committee has sort of limited scope on what we discuss, too. So I just wanna say, everybody thank you, and looking forward to continue work in this Committee. Yes, Mr. Couch?

COUNCILMEMBER COUCH: One last thing. I would like to wish Director Ginoza happy birthday.

MR. GINOZA: Thank you.

CHAIR COCHRAN: Wow. Happy birthday. Let's all sing. Anyways, I just, happy birthday, Mr. Ginoza.

MR. GINOZA: Thank you.

CHAIR COCHRAN: And many more to you. And again, I wanna thank the Departments for the wonderful rapport I believe we've built for the last two years, and looking forward to continued, you know, cordial, productive relationships in moving forward this year. So happy New Year, Gung Hee Fat Choy everybody, and without any further business scheduled, this meeting is adjourned.

ACTION: DEFER pending further discussion.

ADJOURN: 3:25 p.m.

February 11, 2013

APPROVED:

ELLE COCHRAN, Chair
Infrastructure and Environmental Management Committee

iem:min:130211:ak

Transcribed by: Amanda Kaili

February 11, 2013

CERTIFICATE

I, Amanda Kaili, hereby certify that the foregoing represents to the best of my ability, a true and correct transcript of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not in any way concerned with the cause.

DATED this 4th day of March 2013, in Kahului, Hawaii.

Amanda Kaili